

# American Opinion Summary

## Department of State

document file copy  
do not remove

No. 81

August 28, 1962

1. Berlin
2. Cuba

### 1. BERLIN

The Western Big Three are currently exhibiting both "unity and firmness" in their diplomatic dealings with the Soviet Union over Berlin, a number of commentators state (e.g., Neal Stanford in C.S. Monitor). But some press and Congressional sources warn that Communist "salami tactics" are taking a toll of the allied position in Berlin and call for a more "positive" policy (e.g., Sen. Javits, R-N.Y.).

The policy of our State Department is "absolutely correct" in announcing that the Soviet Union will be held responsible for carrying out its obligations in Berlin, says the New York Mirror. Others agree that the Western response to abolition of the Soviet command post in Berlin was "properly firm" (Milwaukee Journal, Providence Journal, Denver Post, Balt. Sun). And the latest allied notes are praised by several for the "candor" with which they pinpoint Russian responsibility for the dangerous situation along the Berlin wall.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, with others, calls on the Russians to accept the Western bid for talks in Berlin before there is an "explosion" (e.g., N.Y. Herald Tribune, Wash. Post). All these warn that continuation of "inflammatory incidents are certain to have unhappy consequences for Russia as well as the West." However, the Post and N.Y. Times concede there is little hope the Soviets will listen to this "reasonable proposal."

Meanwhile, others contend that it is academic to tell the Russians they "can't" repudiate their role; they've already done it (e.g. Chicago News, Wash. Star). It will require "more skill and coolness on the part of the allies than has been shown in the past as the Russians have steadily nibbled away the base from which the allies seek to preserve West Berlin," concludes the News.

The Baltimore Sun, believing that a "major test" is approaching--when East German police will demand to check the papers of allied personnel passing into their zone--observes: "We will have a chance soon to see how well and how wisely" the Western contingency planners have planned.

More than "diplomatic protests" are required, says Sen. Keating (R-N.Y.), to counter the latest Soviet move. The time has come to make "unmistakably clear, by actions as well as words, that the West will remain in West Berlin as a matter of right and will

Public Opinion Studies Staff • Bureau of Public Affairs

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

BERLIN  
(Contd.)

not recognize East German authority in that area." According to the New York News, Gen. Clay is the "man to take on the job, and the sooner he is reassigned to Berlin the better."

Sen. Javits (R-N.Y.) proposes that the Western allies take the "initiative" by renouncing the four-power agreement governing Berlin, on the grounds that it has been "flagrantly violated" by the USSR and is "no longer binding." He suggested these moves under a new policy: Incorporate West Berlin into the Federal Republic "with all the judicial rights and protections of the NATO treaty;" shut off trade between East and West Germany.

2. CUBA

Most commenting take a grave view of the reported arrival of 5,000 Soviet "technicians" in Cuba. "This build-up breeds danger," declares the Watertown Times; and "the American people are bound to express more concern than this 'watching' technique" which characterizes the "state department attitude" (similarly, Wash. Star, Scripps-Howard's Wash. News).

Several call for U.S. "action." The increase of Communist bloc arms and equipment within Cuba violates the Monroe Doctrine, and gives the U.S. "every right to land troops," Sen. Capehart (R-Ind.) insists [similarly, Rep. Derwinski (R-Ill.), David Lawrence, Wilburn P. Akers in Chicago Sun-Times].

But others endorse "the administration's reticence" regarding Cuba (Denver Post), and its resistance to "the clamor on the extreme right for direct intervention" (Washington Post). The New York Herald Tribune concurs in President Kennedy's expressed opinion that the Cuban aim appears to be strengthening internal security. The New York Times counsels that it is best to follow the "difficult and frustrating" U.S. course of isolating Cuba with economic embargoes.

All agree that the shelling of Havana by Cuban exiles based in Miami was "a breach of U.S. neutrality which cannot be countenanced" (Phila. Inquirer; N.Y. Her. Trib.). Such sorties aid Castro only, the New York Times asserts; and the U.S. statements to those involved should be "couched in terms effectively to discourage repetition."

Some, however, stress "deep sympathy" with the goals of the Cuban exiles (e.g., Balt. Sun). To Max Lerner, some factors "may more than counterbalance" the impropriety of the raid--its "success," and its demonstration to the Cuban people "that they have not been forgotten or abandoned" (in N.Y. Post).